SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
STEPHANIE SMITH			IAL SYSTEMS, INC		
OTEL TRAVE CHILL		INCO MINANO	AL STOTEWS, INC		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence	of First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Ad	dress)			
Craig Thor Kimmel, E	squire	E	ND CONDEMNATION CASES, US ) INVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE	
Kimmel & Silverman,	P.C.	Attorneys (If Known)			
30 E. Butler Pike		, (11 ,			
Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888		n			
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)		PRINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government	₩ 3 Federal Question	(For Diversity Cases Only)	) PTF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF	
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)		O 1 O 1 Incorporated or Pri of Business In This	incipal Place 🛛 4 🗇 4	
D 2 U.S. Government	① 4 Diversity	Citizen of Another State	O 2 D 2 Incorporated and P		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		of Business In A	Another State	
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	O 3 O 3 Foreign Nation	06 06	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)				
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	TORTS			1	
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUI O 340 Airplane O 362 Personal Injury		(J) 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 (D) 423 Withdrawal	400 State Reapportionment     410 Antimust	
🗇 130 Miller Act	O 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpracti	ce 🗗 625 Drug Related Seizure	28 USC 157	430 Banks and Banking	
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability		PROPERTY RIGHTS	O 450 Commerce O 460 Deportation	
& Enforcement of Judgment  [] 151 Medicare Act	Sinnder © 368 Asbestos Persoi © 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product	ial	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent	470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations	
151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability	☐ 660 Occupational	30 Patent		
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPE: ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud	RTY Safety/Health  G 690 Other	*	490 Cable/Sat TV	
(Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment		S MARKETER BABOR MARKET	S SSOCIAL SECURITY	810 Selective Service     850 Securities/Commodities/	
of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal	710 Fair Labor Standards	CI 861 HIA (1395IT)	Excliange	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	St Motor Vehicle Property Damag     Product Liability		☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410	
(J 195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability	y 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	D 864 SSID Title XVI	890 Other Statutory Actions	
196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY	Injury CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITION	& Disclosure Act  NSS 0 740 Railway Labor Act	O 865 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vac	ate   790 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Environmental Matters	
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	O 442 Employment Sentence O 443 Housing/ Habens Corpus:	79t Empl, Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant)  © 871 IRS—Third Party	894 Energy Allocation Act     895 Freedom of Information	
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations		26 USC 7609	Act	
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability ☐ 290 All Other Real Property	444 Welfare     535 Death Penalty     445 Amer, w/Disabilities -    540 Mandamus & C	ther 0 462 Naturalization Applicab		O 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access	
to any time transitionary	Employment	🗇 463 Habeas Corpus -		to Justice	
	Other 555 Prison Conditio	n Alien Detainee  3 465 Other Immigration		© 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights	Actions		VIII (1 III III VI	
V. ORIGIN  (Place an "X" in One Box Only)  (Place an "X" in On					
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):					
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI					
VII. REQUESTED IN	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		CHECK YES only	if demanded in complaint:	
COMPLAINT: UNDER F.R.C.P. 23 JURY DEMAND: Ø Yes 🗆 No					
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER					
Explanation:					
4/15/	(1)	1/1			
DATE	SIGNATURE (	OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD			
<b>y</b>					

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar.					
Address of Plaintiff: 125 Summer field Cart, Waverly, MN 55390					
Address of Defendant: 507 Prodential Rd., Harsham, PA 19044					
Place of Accident, incident or Transaction:					
(Usc Reverse Side For Additional Space)					
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation an	d any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock?				
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□				
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	YesD No				
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:					
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:				
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:					
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	r previously terminated action in this court?				
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su	Yeso NoL				
action in this court?	it pending or within one year previously terminated				
2. Done this grow in the set only the	Ycs□ No□				
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in sult or any earlier nu terminated action in this court?	<u> </u>				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Yes D No D				
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?				
	Yes□ No□				
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)					
A Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:				
<ol> <li>□ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts</li> <li>□ FELA</li> </ol>	Insurance Contract and Other Contracts				
3. Dones Act-Personal Injury	2. Airplane Personal Injury				
4. © Antitrust	3. Assault, Defamation				
5. Patent	4.   Marine Personal Injury				
2	<ol> <li>□ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury</li> </ol>				
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. Other Personal Injury (Please				
7 D. Civil Diales	specify)				
7. Civil Rights	7.  Products Liability				
8. Habeas Corpus	8.  Products Liability — Asbestos				
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	<ol><li>□ All other Diversity Cases</li></ol>				
10. D Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)				
11. All other Federal Question Cases \5 U.S.C. \\092 (Please specify)					
ARBITRATION CERTIF	CICATION				
(Check Appropriate Cate	gory)				
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and be	lief the damages recoverable to this shall easily an addition of the state of the s				
#190'000'00 exclusive of fufetest and costs;	and, the damages recoverable in tits civil action case exceed the sum of				
O Relief other than monetary damages is sought.					
DATE: 4/15/11 Craig tha Kimmel	57100				
Attorney-at-Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there	Attorney I.D.# has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38				
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or whexcept as noted above,	thin one year previously terminated action in this court				
Mall A. W. V.	<b>~</b>				
DATE: THOU SIMM!	<u> 57100</u>				
CDV 600 (6/08)	Altomey I.D.#				

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

## CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Stephanie S	mith	CIVIL ACTION		
NCO Financial	systems, Inc.	NO.		
In accordance with the Ciplaintiff shall complete a Ciplaintiff shall complete a Ciplaint and serside of this form.) In the designation, that defendant the plaintiff and all other put which that defendant be	vil Justice Expense and Del Case Management Track Des Eve a copy on all defendants. Event that a defendant doe t shall, with its first appeara parties, a Case Management lieves the case should be ass		me of everse g said ve on	
SELECT ONE OF THE	FOLLOWING CASE MAI	NAGEMENT TRACKS:		
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases	s brought under 28 U.S.C. §	2241 through § 2255.	( )	
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ( )				
(c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. (				
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.			( )	
commonly referred to		racks (a) through (d) that are ecial or intense management by iled explanation of special	( )	
(f) Standard Management	- Cases that do not fall into	any one of the other tracks.	X	
4  15  11 Date 215-540-8888	Ckrig Than Kim Attorney-at-law 877-788-286	Med Stephanie Smith Attorney for Kimmel@creditky		
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# $\mathbf{H}$

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

STEPHANIE SMITH,	)
Plaintiff	) )
v.	) Case No.:
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.,	) COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR
Defendant	) JURY TRIAL )
	) (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices)

#### **COMPLAINT**

STEPHANIE SMITH ("Plaintiff"), by and through her attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"):

#### INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA").

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Waverly, Minnesota 55390.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.
- 9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and Defendant attempted to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 11. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 12. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not

 engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 13. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 14. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

15. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt from Plaintiff.

I

- 16. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 17. Beginning in 2007 and continuing through August 2010, Defendant repeatedly and continuously contacted Plaintiff on her cellular telephone seeking and demanding payment for an alleged student loan debt.
- 18. Defendant contacted Plaintiff almost every day causing Plaintiff to receive, on average, at least two (2) collection calls a day, and at times, more than ten (10) collection calls a week.
- 19. When Defendant did speak with Plaintiff, it threatened and/or implied that nonpayment of the alleged debt would result in legal action against her.
- 20. In addition, Defendant and its employee, identified as "Patty," contacted Plaintiff at her place of employment in an attempt to collect the debt.
- 21. On several occasions, Plaintiff has instructed Defendant not to call her at her place of employment.
- 22. Most recently, on August 2, 2010, when Defendant called Plaintiff at her place of employment, Plaintiff again instructed Defendant that not to contact her place of employment, as she was not permitted to receive personal calls at work.
- 23. However, Defendant ignored Plaintiff's instructions and continued to contact her at her place of employment.
- 24. In fact, Defendant contacted Plaintiff's employer to verify her employment, disclosing Plaintiff's social security number to co-worker.
- 25. To further harass and embarrass Plaintiff, Defendant contacted Plaintiff's neighbors requesting that the neighbors give Plaintiff an "urgent message."

- 26. When Plaintiff called the number provided by her neighbors, she learned that it was Defendant contacting her through her neighbors.
- 27. Finally, Plaintiff has made several requests that Defendant provide her with current written balance for the alleged debt.
- 28. However, Defendant has not provided Plaintiff with any information regarding the amount of the debt.
- 29. In fact, Defendant has not provided Plaintiff with any written correspondence regarding the balance of the debt in over two (2) years.
- 30. The only information Plaintiff has received about the debt is a federal recapture letter, which in the past three (3) years, more than 50% of the alleged student loan debt has been recaptured.
- 31. Plaintiff was unaware of the amount Defendant was attempting to collect and whether the federal recaptured funds were applied to the amount of the alleged debt, as a result of Defendant purposefully not providing Plaintiff with a statement containing the balance on the account.
- 32. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

33. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute. <u>Taylor v. Perrin, Landry, deLaunay & Durand</u>, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." <u>Russell v. Equifax A.R.S.</u>, 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); <u>see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp.</u> 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status

6 7

8

10

9

12 13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

22

24

25

violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).

- 34. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).
- 35. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

### COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

36. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

- a. Defendant violated of the FDCPA generally;
- b. Defendant violated §1692b(2) of the FDCPA by stating that Plaintiff owed a
  debt to another person, specifically her neighbors;
- c. Defendant violated §1692b(3) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff's neighbors more than once about a debt alleged to be owed by Plaintiff;
- d. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(3) of the FDCPA when it contacted the Plaintiff at her place of employment after Defendant knew or had reason to know that Plaintiff's employer prohibited Plaintiff from receiving such communication;
- e. Defendant violated §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff's neighbors about a debt alleged to be owed by Plaintiff without Plaintiff's prior consent;
- f. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
- g. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
- Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
- Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA by threatening to take action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken;

- j. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- k. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt; and
- Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, STEPHANIE SMITH, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual compensatory damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

l

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, STEPHANIE SMITH, demands a jury trial in

this case.

DATED: 4/15/1/

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

Craig Thor Kimmel
Attorney ID # 57100

Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com